

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application view the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-12 and 14-18 remain pending in the application. Claim 13 has been canceled.

The drawings are objected to, because the numbers, letters and/or reference characters are not plain, legible and/or well defined. In response, replacement drawing sheets are being submitted concurrently herewith.

The disclosure is objected to because of the noted informalities. In response, the specification has been amended, and accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

Claim 10 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(i). In response, claim 10 has been amended and accordingly this objection should be withdrawn.

Claim 11 is objected to because of the noted informalities. In response, claim 11 has been amended and accordingly the objection should be withdrawn.

Claim 10-14 are objected to because of the noted informalities. In response, these claims have been amended and accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In response, the specification has been amended and accordingly this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sheinvald (1998). In response, claim 10 has been amended and is believed to be patentable over Sheinvald for the reasons discussed below.

Sheinvald discloses a process for localizing one of several sources, the sources moving in relation to a sensor array.

The main difference in the teaching of Sheinvald and the present application is that, Sheinvald does not disclose or suggest localizing the position of a mobile source when the incidence angles vary during the displacement of a mobile.

Claim 10 has been amended to emphasize this difference. Accordingly, claim 10 is patentable over Sheinvald claims 11-18 recited additional, important limitations and should be patentable along with claim 10 as well as on their own merits. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 12-16 and 18 are provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-6, 8, and 12 of co-pending application number 11/085,253. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection be held in abeyance pending the allowance of claim 10.

All objections and rejections having been address is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

**LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP**



Kenneth M. Berner  
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1111  
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile  
**Date: July 16, 2007**  
KMB/jlb